

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/005,182	COHEN ET AL.
Examiner Boris Pesin	Art Unit 2174	
All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>Non-Final</u>	
(1) <u>Boris Pesin</u> .	(3) _____	
(2) <u>James Schutz</u> .	(4) _____	
Date of Interview: <u>21 September 2005</u>	Time: _____	
Type of Interview:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Telephonic <input type="checkbox"/> Video Conference <input type="checkbox"/> Personal (Copy given to: <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's representative)	
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
NA		
Claims discussed:		
Claim 3		
Prior art documents discussed:		
NA		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:		
See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
<input type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. <input type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.		
<hr/> <hr/> <hr/>		<hr/> <hr/>
(Examiner/SPE Signature)		(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner believes that the limitation "wherein at least one of the user accesses is to an object of interest that is not in the task sequence" is not supported by the specification. The Examiner phoned the Attorney of record for clarification in this matter. The Attorney explained that he felt that the limitation is supported by the specification, in particular on Page 7. He specifically pointed out from the passage, "For instance, a task could be defined as completing steps one through four. The user could then inquire as to how frequently this task is completed or the typical manner in which the task is or is not completed." The Attorney acknowledged if the task was not completed that it was inherent that user must have accessed an object that is not in the task sequence.